1. The aff must only defend valuing rehabilitation over retribution using the actor prescribed in the resolution.
2. He defends rehabilitation in a vacuum without defending the United States criminal justice system.

Reciprocity – Under his interpretation the aff doesn’t have to defend an actor and the neg does. This kills reciprocity because the aff can generate offense that is specific to any criminal justice system in the world while the neg is bound to the United States. Reciprocity has the strongest internal to fairness to maintain competitive equity between both sides to access the ballot.

Ground- Under the aff I have no way in knowing which way the affirmative approaches the resolution and don’t get DAs that link to his advocacy because the 1AR can shift out by claiming agent disparities. This also excludes politics DAs that indict the US government. Political ground is key to education for two reasons: 1) Politics is often not included in resolutions making it an unexplored subject and 2) Politics is key to the implications of the health care plan since it relates to how people act upon it. Further ground is key to fairness because if I can be shifted from my advocacy I have no way to access the ballot straightforwardly. Also, stable advocacy is key to fairness to pin them down so I can adequately respond, and key to education so I can engage the aff and understand the interaction between them.